

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the remarks and amendments made herein.

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The “heat-cooking chamber” limitation has been canceled from the claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

The abstract of the disclosure was objected to and has been amended herein to cure such objections. Withdrawal of this objection is requested.

Claims 6-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Sato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,759,964). Traversal of this rejection is made for at least the following reasons. Sato fails to disclose a printed board having heat-radiating fins and a semiconductor switching element on a first side and a thermistor on a second side of the printed board, the thermistor being soldered to a leg portion of the switching element that project through the board to the second side, as required by claim 6. Instead, Sato discloses an insulating plate 117 having a IGBT soldered to a first side of the plate and a temperature sense device installed near the IGBT on the same first side of the insulating plate 117. Cooling fins 119 are soldered to a metal plate 188, which is in turn, soldered to an opposite second side of the insulating plate 117. Thus, Sato fails to disclose a printed circuit board in which heat-radiating fins and semiconductor switching element are provided on the same side. Because Sato does not disclose each and every limitation set forth in independent claim 6, Sato cannot anticipate such claim. Allowance of claim 6 and claims 7-9, which depend therefrom is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Machara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,967,051) in view of Sato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,759,964). Traversal of this rejection is made for at least the following reasons. When a cooling fan that cools a switching element is stopped during operation under a rated power, temperature of the switching element rises. In accordance with the present claims, when the temperature exceeds a predetermined level, a controller lowers the output power of the inverter so that operating of the inverter is continued. In contrast, according to Machara, when the inverter is operated over a

Appl. No. 10/553,155
Amdt. Dated August 17, 2007
Reply to Notice of Non-Compliant Amdt. mailed August 9, 2007

rated power, the power down control lowers the power for a predetermined time period. The power down is not dependent upon on temperature detection. There is nothing within Maehara that discloses that the inverter is continuously operated with lowered power even when the cooling fan is stopped. Sato does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Maehara. For at least the above reasons, the combination of Maehara and Sato does not render claims 1-5 and 10 obvious. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,317,976) in view of Sato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,759,964). Traversal of this rejection is made for at least the following reasons. There is nothing within Noda that discloses, teaches, or suggests that a controller lowers an output of the inverter in case the fan has fault so that the inverter continues to operate with a lowered power even if the fan is normally operated. In fact, Noda is silent on this issue. Sato fails to make up for the deficiencies of Noda. For at least the above reasons, the combination of Noda and Sato does not render claims 1-5 and 10 obvious. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 38836.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

/Una L. Lauricia/
Una L. Lauricia, Reg. No. 48,998

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700
Date: August 17, 2007